

# Washington University Law Review

---

Volume 21 | Issue 1

---

January 1935

## Editorial Notes

The Editors

*Washington University School of Law*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law\\_lawreview](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview)



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

The Editors, *Editorial Notes*, 21 ST. LOUIS L. REV. 035 (1935).

Available at: [https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law\\_lawreview/vol21/iss1/3](https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_lawreview/vol21/iss1/3)

This Editorial Notes is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School at Washington University Open Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Washington University Law Review by an authorized administrator of Washington University Open Scholarship. For more information, please contact [digital@wumail.wustl.edu](mailto:digital@wumail.wustl.edu).

# ST. LOUIS LAW REVIEW

---

Edited by the Undergraduates of Washington University School of Law,  
St. Louis. Published in December, February, April, and June at  
Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

---

Subscription Price \$2.00 per Annum.

Seventy-five Cents per Copy.

---

A subscriber desiring to discontinue his subscription should send notice to  
that effect. Otherwise it will be continued.

---

## THE STAFF

ABE J. GARLAND, *Editor-in-Chief*

ARTHUR J. BOHN, *Associate Editor*

J. DONALD YOUNG, *Business Manager*

JAMES ANDING

VAUGHN BALL

EUNICE COX

WILLIAM EDGAR

AGNES EILERS

WALTER FREEDMAN

JOHN FREEZE

OTIS GARLAND

JOHN HALEY

LEONARD JACOBS

WILLIAM KEADY

ROBERT LINDSEY

JAMES LOGAN

HENRY LUEDDE

PHILIP MAXEINER

MRS. MARTHA RAINFORD

WILBERT SCHADE, JR.

JAMES WEAR

CHARLES WRIGHT

ROBERT YOST

RALPH F. FUCHS, *Faculty Adviser*

ISRAEL TREIMAN, *Faculty Adviser*

---

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

WALTER D. COLES  
FRANKLIN FERRISS

CHARLES NAGEL

JAMES A. SEDDON  
THEODORE RASSIEUR

## ADVISORY COMMITTEE

R. W. CHUBB, *Chairman*

R. L. ARONSON

F. P. ASCHMEYER

G. A. BUDER, JR.

R. S. BULL

J. M. DOUGLAS

S. ELSON

J. J. GRAVELY

A. M. HOENNY

J. M. HOLMES

H. W. KROEGER

R. H. MCROBERTS

D. L. MILLAR

C. H. LUECKING, *Secretary*

M. OPPENHEIMER

R. R. NEUHOFF

R. B. SNOW

K. P. SPENCER

M. R. STAHL

M. L. STEWART

---

## Editorial Notes

### CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

RALPH R. NEUHOFF, LL.B., Washington University, 1916,  
who submits *Retrospective Tax Laws* is a frequent contribu-  
tor of articles concerning taxation. For some years he has  
lectured on this subject as a member of the faculty of the  
Washington University Law School. He is a member of the  
St. Louis, Missouri Bar.

WILLIAM CLARK SCHMIDT, LL.B., Washington University, 1935, submits an analysis of the *Constitutional Limitations Upon Legislative Power to Alter Incidents of the Shareholder's Status in Private Corporations*. For this article Mr. Schmidt was awarded the Mary Hitchcock Thesis Prize of 1935. He is now a member of the St. Louis, Missouri Bar.

## Notes

### "LEGAL INTEREST" FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUITS TO ANNUL ORDERS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The federal district courts have been invested with jurisdiction over suits to enjoin, set aside, or annul orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.<sup>1</sup> There is no provision, however, as to the proper parties to maintain the suit.<sup>2</sup> "The determination of the question . . . is left by the Interstate Commerce Act

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 16 of the Hepburn Act (34 Stat. 584, 592, 1906) provided for review of orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That section provided in part, "The venue of suits brought in any of the Circuit Courts of the United States against the Commission to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend any order or requirement of the Commission shall be in the district where the carrier against whom such order or requirement may have been made has its principal operating office, and may be brought at any time after such order is promulgated." See *B. & O. R. R. v. I. C. C.* (1909) 215 U. S. 216, 219. In 1910 Congress created the Commerce Court with exclusive jurisdiction to hear "cases brought to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend in whole or in part any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission." (1910) 36 Stat. 539, (1911) 36 Stat. 1148, (1916) U. S. Comp. Stat. sec. 993. In 1913 Congress abolished the Commerce Court and transferred its jurisdiction to the District Courts. (1913) 38 Stat. 219, 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 41 (28). But the District Courts are specially constituted if an interlocutory injunction is sought. (1913) 38 Stat. 220, 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 47. State courts are without jurisdiction to entertain suits seeking to enjoin, set aside or annul an order of the Commission. *Lambert Run Coal Co. v. B. & O. R. R. Co.* (1922) 258 U. S. 377; *St. Louis Connecting R. Co. v. Blumberg* (1927) 325 Ill. 387, 156 N. E. 298.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra*, note 1. Congress has provided, however, for the party defendant, providing that the suits "shall be brought against the United States." (1910) 36 Stat. 542, (1911) 36 Stat. 1149, 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 46. See also (1911) 36 Stat. 1150, (1913) 38 Stat. 219, 28 U. S. C. A. sec. 48. See *Lambert Run Coal Co. v. B. & O. R. R. Co.*, *supra*, note 1; *State of North Dakota ex rel. Lemke v. Chicago N. W. Ry. Co.* (1922) 257 U. S. 485; *Venner v. Michigan Cent'l R. R. Co.* (1926) 271 U. S. 127, 130.